

143

2025:PHHC:101948-DB



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

LPA-1809-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 07.08.2025

Balwinder Singh

...Appellant

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. G.S.Dhindsa, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Aftab Singh Khara, Senior DAG, Punjab.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J.(Oral)

The appellant has impugned the order of the Single Bench dated 29.05.2025 passed in CWP-16463 of 2025, whereby the writ petition preferred by him seeking direction to appoint him as a Sub-Inspector has been declined.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant had participated in the selection process for the appointment to the post of Sub-Inspector under 2% reservation for Wards of Police Personnel. He further submits that since the appellant fulfilled all the requisite conditions, therefore, he was entitled for appointment, however, some of the ineligible candidates have been appointed instead.

3. Heard.

4. The appellant had taken part in the selection process to the post of Sub Inspector, which was initiated in the year 2016 and concluded in the year 2017. He had earlier preferred a petition bearing CWP No.1185-2017, wherein the appellant had sought his appointment and quashing of appointment of private respondents therein, and the writ petition was dismissed by order of the Single Bench dated 11.03.2019 (Annexure P-13) after observing as follows:-

“Learned State counsel submits that petitioner could not be selected as he did not qualify the main examination. He has referred to para 1 of the reply by way of Iqbal Preet Singh Sahota, Admn.-cum-Chairman, Central Recruitment Board, Punjab. Same reads as under:-

“1. That petitioner applied for the post of Sub Inspector in District Police Cadre (Male) in BC, Wards of Police Personnel Category. He qualified physical trials and appeared in the written examination. He got 62 marks in written examination whereas cut off marks of Wards of Police Personnel Category were 69 marks, whereas cut off of BC Category was 79 marks. So, his name was not included in the merit list.”

The aforesaid contention remains uncontroverted. Petitioner remains unrepresented. None appeared for the petitioner on the last date of hearing as well.

In view of statement made by the State counsel, no cause of action survives. Petition is hereby dismissed.”

5. It is apparent that the appellant had secured less marks than the last selected candidate in the category of Wards of Police Personnel. The appellant had earlier approached this Court in 2017 and the relief, which he had sought was declined to him. The order had attained the

finality, but the appellant has chosen to approach this Court again after six years by preferring another writ petition and seeking similar relief as sought in the earlier writ filed in 2017, therefore, the subsequent writ petition which has been preferred in the year 2025 is wholly misconceived and frivolous.

6. Consequently, we do not find any illegality in the order passed by the Single Bench dated 29.05.2025 dismissing the writ petition preferred by the appellant seeking appointment to the post of the Sub-Inspector. The Letters Patent Appeal being devoid of merits stands dismissed accordingly.

7. All pending miscellaneous application(s) shall also stand disposed of.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

07.08.2025

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No